

Civil Works Review Board (CWRB)  
Project Summary

Project Reviewed: Montauk Point, New York

Date of CWRB: 31 October 2005

CWRB Members: MG Johnson (DCG, Chair), Riley (DCW); Tom Waters (Planning CoP); Don Basham (Engineering and Construction CoP); and Jerry Barnes (LRD RIT Leader).

Key Participants:

HQUSACE: CWRB Members, Ed Theriot (NAD RIT Leader), Office of Water Project Review (Colosimo, Einarsen, Warren, Ware), Policy and Policy Compliance Division (Leef), Office of Counsel (Cribbin) & NAD RIT (Fox, Groska).

NAD: BG Grisoli, Stuart Piken, Joe Vietri, Pete Blum and Richard Bing.

NAN: Col Polo, Arthur Connolly, Frank Santomauro, Tom Hudson, Leonard Houston, Frank Verga and Christopher Ricciardi

ASACW: Terry Breyman

Sponsor: Fred Nuffer and Mike Stankiewicz (NYDEC, Division of Water) and Greg Donohue (Montauk Historic Society)

OWPR Recommendation: Approval of the report for release for State and Agency review.

CWRB Decision Made: Approval of release of the report for State and Agency review and filing in the Federal Register.

Vote: Unanimous. No conditions were placed on the approval to release the report for S&A review.

Key Issues/Questions Raised by the CWRB (in no particular order):

1. The “single owner” issue was discussed by CWRB members. In particular, the need for the sponsor to acknowledge their responsibilities in perpetuity via signing of the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) was discussed. It was explained that the sponsor will be the State of New York, and that they are well aware that their responsibilities must be in perpetuity.
2. The CWRB inquired about the surfing community expressed concerns and how they were resolved. The district explained that they worked with the surfing community to hear and address their concerns in the plan formulation as best they could. It was generally acknowledged that the surfing community was biased toward the “no action” plan as they could not be convinced that the project would not affect the break

point that occurs downstream of the proposed project. MG Johnson acknowledged that POD experienced similar reactions from the surfing community and that MVS models were used to demonstrate the affect of various alternatives on the surf. It was suggested that NAD may want to work with POD to share experiences and approaches to addressing the surfing community concerns.

3. The distinction between the NED plan (73-year level of protection) and the 150-year level of protection plan were discussed at length by the CWRB. Specifically, the CWRB members wondered under what conditions the 150-year plan would be supportable. The sponsor indicated, when questioned by the CWRB, that they were interested in the possibility of implementing the larger project, but stated they did not have the resources for “buying up” to the larger plan as a non-Federal cost, even though the cost increment was relatively small (\$15M vs. \$17M).

It seemed to a number of CWRB members that the larger plan could be supportable if there were other benefits to the larger plan that were not captured through a traditional NED type analysis (as allowed for by the new EC’s, as acknowledged by MG Riley). Items that the district could consider to support the larger plan included regional benefits, loss of life, sudden failure and loss of light house, and loss of the navigation aide purpose of the lighthouse. It was specifically noted that the support for a larger plan would be easier if the project involved differences in the loss of life, instead of property. NAD and NAN concurred with the idea of upgrading the plan, but indicated that the study as conducted, did not address other potential benefits in terms of loss of life, navigation aides, nor regional benefits. Further discussions recognized that catastrophic losses at the site were not likely (no loss of life would be anticipated and it was equally unlikely that there would be a loss of navigation function at the site). The CWRB members encouraged the district to ensure the report lays out the risks and consequences of the plans considered, in particular the 73-year and 150-year plans. Further, the CWRB members encouraged the district to make sure the report tells the full story of the range of benefits of all alternatives to the extent practicable in the finalization of the report. The need to accurately document the historical significance of the structure in the report was also mentioned. Cost-sharing of the larger plan, if supported, was not discussed by the CWRB members.

4. Questions regarding the erosion modeling were discussed. The CWRB inquired as to whether the erosion forces were progressive or advanced. The district indicated that they have a good handle on erosion processes. The district explained that the attack is multi-faceted and the failure mode would be incremental, not sudden.

Other Issues of Note: None.

Attachments: PowerPoint handouts (including District Engineer, Division Engineer, Sponsor and Office of Water Project Review briefs); Project Summary; DE Transmittal Letter; and Draft Chief of Engineers Report.